

## Message Text

PAGE 01 LONDON 03605 271714 Z

46

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ARA-11 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-09 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-14 USIA-12

OMB-01 RSR-01 /103 W

----- 033482

R 271703 Z MAR 73

FM AMEMBASSY LONDON

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 0045

INFO DOD WASHDC

AMCONSUL NASSAU

C O N F I D E N T I A L LONDON 03605

E. O. 11652: XGDS-

TAGS: MARR, XL, UK

SUBJECT: TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS

1. DIXON ( FCO WEST INDIES DEPT) ASKED TO SEE US LAST WEEK " TO DISCUSS CERTAIN ASPECTS OF U. S. DEFENSE FACILITIES IN TURKS AND CAICOS." HE OPENED BY RECALLING THAT 1961 WEST INDIES DEFENSE AREAS AGREEMENT CALLED FOR PERIODIC REVIEW. ARTICLE XXIV, PARAGRAPH 2 SPECIFICALLY PROVIDED THAT AGREEMENT WOULD BE REVIEWED IN 1968 TO CONSIDER INTER ALIA POSSIBLE MODIFICATIONS OF TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT. 1968 REVIEW HAD RESULTED IN CERTAIN MEASURES TO MEET DESIRES OF ISLANDERS. SINCE THEN, SAID GET BETTER TERMS FOR U. S. FACILITIES, AND BRITISH HAVE PUT THEM OFF WITH ARGUMENT THAT ANY FURTHER MODIFICATION NOT POSSIBLE UNTIL 1973 REVIEW. IN EXAMINING ARTICLE XXIV, HOWEVER, FCO LEGAL EXPERTS OF PRELIMINARY OPINION THAT THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT FOR 1973 REVIEW TO CONSIDER MODIFICATIONS; IT ENVISAGES ONLY A DETERMINATION WHETHER THERE IS A CONTINUING NEED FOR DEFENSE AREAS.

2. DIXON SAID PURPOSE OF HIS APPROACH WAS TO GET INFORMAL READING OF U. S. ATTITUDE TOWARD 1973 REVIEW. DID WE AGREE WITH FCO INTERPRETATION OF CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 LONDON 03605 271714 Z

ARTICLE XXIV? IF SO, HOW LITERALLY WOULD WE INSIST ON THIS INTERPRETATION? IN THE LIGHT OF PERSISTENT LOCAL

PRESSURES FOR LIBERALIZING TERMS UNDER WHICH WE OPERATE, WOULD THE U. S. BE AT ALL DISPOSED AT L. RECOMMENDATION 15 ( EAST- WEST RELATIONS) - WORDING OF SECOND HALF OF IS DRAFT COMMENT IN PARA ( C), BEGINNING " AS REGARDS POSSIBLE FOLLOW- ON...", SEEMS SOMEWHAT AWKWARD, AND MIGHT BE SIMPLIFIED AND IMPROVED ALONG THE FOLLOWING LINES: " AS REGARDS POSSIBLE FOLLOW- ON ARRANGEMENTS AFTER CSCE, MEMBERS OF THE WARSAW PACT HAVE PROPOSED THE CREATION OF A NEW PERMANENT BODY, THE EXACT PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE OF WHICH HAS NOT BEEN FULLY CLARIFIED. MEMBER COUNTRIES OF THE ALLIANCE ARE OF THE OPINION THAT A CLEARER VIEW WILL BE NEEDED OF THE PRACTICAL RESULTS LIKELY TO EMERGE FROM CSCE BEFORE THE UTILITY OF ANY NEW FOLLOW- ON MACHINERY CAN BE JUDGED." IS DRAFT COMMENTS ON PARA ( D), FIRST AND SECOND TICKS, ARE ACCEPT- ABLE. HOWEVER, THIRD TICK IS NOT ADDRESSED. THIS COULD BE CORRECTED BY ADDING THE FOLLOWING SENTENCES TO THE IS COMMENT: " ALLIED GOVERNMENTS HAVE BEEN CAREFULLY INVESTI- GATING THE MILITARY AND POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF A NUMBER OF REDUCTION SCHEMES. NO DECISION HAS BEEN REACHED ON WHICH FORCES AND WEAPONS SHOULD BE PROPOSED FOR POSSIBLE REDUCTION IN MBFR."

2. RECOMMENDATION 18 ( WEATHER MODIFICATION) - WE CAN AGREE TO THE OMISSION OF COMMENT ON THIS RECOMMENDATION, BUT YOU SHOULD MAKE CLEAR IN THE NAC DISCUSSION THAT OUR LACK OF COMMENT DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN ENDORSEMENT.

3. RECOMMENDATION 19 ( CULTURAL ASPECTS OF CSCE) - IS DRAFT DOES NOT COMMENT DIRECTLY ON PARA ( A) CALLING FOR POST- CSCE COOPERATION ON PROBLEMS CONFRONTING SOCIETY. IN OUR VIEW COMMENT COULD APPROPRIATELY CONCUR IN NAA' S HIGHLIGHTING OF SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS AREA OF COOPERATION AND POINT OUT  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 051256

THAT ALLIED CSCE STUDIES ON ENVIRONMENTAL AND S & T MATTERS DEAL WITH AN EXTENSIVE RANGE OF POSSIBLE TOPICS FOR E- W COOPERATION ON PROBLEMS CONFRONTING CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY.

4. RECOMMENDATION 27 ( MULTINATIO EVEN IN A PRELIMINARY WAY. MORE- OVER, BOTH SIDES WOULD HAVE TO BE CAREFUL IN ANY PUBLIC REFERENCES TO THE PROPOSED VISIT TO AVOID GIVING THE IMPRESSION THAT A TRADE AGREEMENT WAS TO BE A SUBJECT UNDER DISCUSSION. BAKER SUGGESTED, AND ZDRAVCHEV AGREED, THAT THE US SIDE SHOULD WORK OUT LANGUAGE WHICH WOULD BE USED TO CHARACTERIZE THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED VISIT ( SEE BELOW).

4. ON THE QUESTION OF THE VISIT' S TIMING, ZDRAVCHEV PROPOSED EARLY APRIL, FIRST SPECIFYING APRIL 3 BUT THEN ACKNOWLEDGING THAT AROUND APRIL 10 MIGHT BE MORE REALISTIC. BAKER SAID THAT BEFORE PRECISE TIMING COULD

BE DISCUSSED, WE WOULD HAVE TO LEARN FROM THE BULGARIANS WHAT TYPE OF BUSINESSES THEY WERE INTERESTED IN VISITING IN THE US. HE NOTED THAT ARRANGING SUCH VISITS OFTEN TAKES TIME, AND HE AGAIN URGED ZDRAVCHEV TO PROVIDE US THIS INFORMATION IF HE WISHED THE VISIT TO OCCUR AT AN EARLY DATE. ZDRAVCHEV AGREED TO DO SO.

--

5. LANGUAGE WHICH WE WILL PROPOSE TO THE BULGARIANS TO DESCRIBE THE NATURE OF THE VISIT BOTH FOR THEIR SUBSTANTIVE INFORMATION AND FOR USE IN ANY PRESS PLAY IS AS FOLLOWS:

QUOTE THE VISIT OF THE BULGARIAN TRADE PROMOTION DELEGATION WILL BE AIMED AT IMPROVING BILATERAL COMMERCIAL CONTACTS AND AT ACQUAINTING BUSINESS REPRESENTATIVES OF BOTH SIDES WITH TRADING CONDITIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES. UNQUOTE.

6. COMMENT: MEETING WITH ZDRAVCHEV HELD BEFORE WE  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 055875

AND, EVIDENTLY, ZDRAVCHEV HAD REPORT OF MARCH 22 SESSION BETWEEN CHARGE AND LUKANOV IN SOFIA. LUKANOV'S DISCUSSION OF A SEPARATE TRADE PROMOTION DELEGATION AND A SUBSEQUENT DELEGATION ( WHICH HE APPARENTLY WOULD LEAD) TO TALK ON A GOVERNMENT LEVEL DIFFERS FROM THE SINGLE DELEGATION ABOUT WHICH ZDRAVCHEV HAS BEEN TALKING. THIS RAISES SOME DOUBT AS TO EFFICACY OF EXCHANGES BETWEEN ZDRAVCHEV AND HIS GOVERNMENT. FACT THAT ZDRAVCHEV ALSO SUGGESTED SENDING US COPY OF PROPOSED TRADE AGREEMENT AFTER OUR REPEATED ASSERTIONS THAT THIS COULD NOT SERVE AS THE BASIS FOR ANY DISCUSSIONS WITH LUKANOV DELEGATION INDICATES THAT HE OR THE GOB ( OR BOTH) ARE STILL THINKING IN TERMS OF DISCUSSING A TRADE AGREEMENT.

7. UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES WE BELIEVE IT WORTH TAKING RISK OF BEING OVERLY REPETITIVE TO DISCUSS ISSUE ONCE AGAIN WITH LUKANOV. HE SHOULD BE TOLD THAT WE WOULD AGREE TO A TRADE PROMOTION DELEGATION ( HIS FIRST STAGE IN REF B) OR TO A TRADE PROMOTION DELEGATION WITH SOME MINISTERIAL REPRESENTATION OF THE TYPE WE HAVE BEEN DISCUSSING WITH ZDRAVCHEV PROVIDED ITS STATED AND ACTUAL PURPOSE CONFORMS TO THE DESCRIPTION IN PARA 5 ABOVE. SUCH A VISIT WOULD START WITH BUSINESS VISITS IN AREAS OF INTEREST TO BULGARS AND BE FOLLOWED BY TALKS WITH WASHINGTON OFFICIALS ON TRADE PROMOTION. IF MINISTERIAL PARTICIPATION INVOLVED WE WOULD NEED CLEAR PRIOR CONFIRMATION FROM BULGARIAN SIDE OF THEIR UNDERSTANDING THAT DISCUSSION OF TRADE AGREEMENT NOT A PROSPECT AT THIS TIME.

8. ZDRAVCHEV HAS APPOINTMENT TO CALL ON SECRETARY  
OF COMMERCE DENT ON MARCH 29 AND THIS POSITION WILL  
BE REPEATED TO HIM AT THAT TIME. ROGERS

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 07 MAY 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 27 MAR 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** garlanwa  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973LONDON03605  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** N/A  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** LONDON  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19730348/abqceftv.tel  
**Line Count:** 169  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** ACTION EUR  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** garlanwa  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:** ANOMALY  
**Review Date:** 02 AUG 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** WITHDRAWN <02-Aug-2001 by maustmc, RDFRD>; RELEASED <02-Aug-2001 by worrelsw>; APPROVED <21-Nov-2001 by garlanwa>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** <DBA CORRECTED> srp 971230  
**Subject:** TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS  
**TAGS:** MARR, UK, XL  
**To:** STATE INFO DOD  
NASSAU  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005